Semi-supervised Speech Enhancement in Modulation Subspace

Pengfei Sun, and Jun Qin

arXiv:1609.09443v1 [cs.SD] 29 Sep 2016

Abstract

Previous studies show that existing speech enhancement algorithms can improve speech quality but not speech intelligibility. In this study, we propose a modulation subspace (MS) based speech enhancement framework, in which the spectrogram of noisy speech is decoupled as the product of a spectral envelop subspace and a spectral details subspace. This decoupling approach provides a method to specifically work on elimination of those noises that greatly affect the intelligibility. Two supervised low-rank and sparse decomposition schemes are developed in the spectral envelop subspace to obtain a robust recovery of speech components. A Bayesian formulation of non-negative factorization (NMF) is used to learn the speech dictionary from the spectral envelop subspace of clean speech samples. In the spectral details subspace, a standard robust principle component analysis (RPCA) is implemented to extract the speech components. The validation results show that compared with four state-of-the-art speech enhancement algorithms, including MMSE-SPP, NMF-RPCA, RPCA, and LARC, both proposed MS based algorithms achieve higher perceptual quality, and also demonstrate superiority on improving speech intelligibility.

Index Terms

speech enhancement, modulation subspace, semi-supervised, low-rank, sparsity, speech intelligibility.

I. Introduction

Speech enhancement is a common topic in speech processing and front end of speech recognition. In general, the goal of speech enhancement is to improve both perceived quality and intelligibility by reducing residual noise while minimizing speech signal distortion. Speech with higher quality is more comfortable for audiences, and comparatively higher intelligibility is measured by lower word recognition error rates. Most of the existing speech enhancement algorithms can achieve high speech quality but relatively low performances on speech intelligibility [1].

Speech intelligibility is mainly affected by vocal tracts, which can be translated as the spectral envelop [2]. The fact that Mel-frequency cepstrum coefficients (MFCC) derived from spectral envelop is efficient in automatic speech recognition algorithms [3] further demonstrates the importance of spectral envelop on intelligibility improvement. Generally, the human speech X is a convolution acoustic procedure in the time domain, corresponding to that vocal excitation (harmonics) is modulated by vocal tract (formants) in the frequency domain:

$$X = X_e \circ X_d \tag{1}$$

where X_e as the 'carrier' modulates the fine-structure X_d, and $\circ$ is the Hadamard product. In the cepstrum domain, along the pseudo-frequency axis, the vocal tract X_e as the identity of the speech is located at low frequency region, and comparatively X_d refers as pitches including the high frequency components [4]. In this perspective, the spectrogram of human speech is the multiplication of two independent processes in the frequency domain. However, most of the existing speech enhancement algorithms based on short time Fourier transform (STFT), no matter unsupervised or supervised methods, focus on the estimation of X, but shed little light on recovering the spectral envelop and details matrices independently. Operating on spectrogram of noisy speech to obtain X has two shortcomings: 1) It cannot reflect the strong correlation in the joint time-frequency (T-F) domain, which actually origins from the formants and pitches, represented by the two modulation subspaces, respectively; 2) In the spectral space, the speech components X as the multiplication of two modulation matrices cannot reflect the acoustic physical features of speech. Previous work [5] indicates that such speech spectral bases are highly overlapped with the convex hull of noise spectral bases, which means that the speech dictionary is coherent to background noise, and could cause an ambiguity in signal separation.

To recover the speech spectrogram matrix, our approach is to extract speech components separately from the two modulation subspaces (i.e., spectral envelop and details subspaces) of noisy speech. Utilizing the definition for clean speech in (1), noisy speech based modulation subspaces can be obtained by the same procedure. In this study, low-rank and sparse decomposition (LSD) is employed to obtain the clean speech envelop and details structures (i.e., X_e and X_d). In the noisy speech envelop subspace Y_e, an offline learned speech envelop dictionary is utilized to conduct the decomposition, and the activation matrix of this spectral envelop dictionary is supposed to be sparse. The noise components projected in the noisy speech envelop subspace Y_e is assumed low rank. Comparatively, in the noisy speech details subspace Y_d, similar assumption is set for both speech and noise components, in which speech is illustrated as sparse structure and the noise is supposed to be low-rank. By extracting speech spectral envelop from the noisy speech envelop subspace and the fine structures Y_e in the spectral details subspace Y_d, the spectrogram of estimated speech can be obtained as the element-wise product of the two sub matrices.

A. Related Work

In this study, our proposed speech enhancement algorithm can be categorized as a semi-supervised LSD in a modulation subspace framework. By exploiting intrinsic decomposition through well convex optimization, low-rank and sparse analysis overcomes the high sensitive of the conventional principle component analysis (PCA) when subjecting to large corruptions. Modulation domain based source separation technologies are mainly developed according to the knowledge that the spectrogram of speech can be described as a time-varying weighted sum of component modulations [6].

1) Low rank and sparse decomposition: The idea of applying LSD to separate speech from background noise is derived from the intrinsic data structure of noisy speech spectrogram, in which background noise usually demonstrates low spectral diversity whereas speeches are more instantaneous and changeable. LSD is well adaptive to the nonstationary noise environments. Some constraints (e.g., masking threshold, noise rank, and block-wise restrictions) relying on priori knowledge about either speech [7]–[9] or noise [10] are imposed to yield better

performances. LSD is also conducted in the spectrogram obtained by wavelet packet transform, which concentrates the energy of speech components and accordingly strengthens its sparsity [11], [12].

In many relevant cases, using a single spectral model to describe the speech signal is insufficient. Because with long-term repeated structure, speech can also demonstrate low-rank characteristic along with sparsity. The coexisting of low-rank and sparse properties in speech requires a more comprehensive constraint to reflect its spectral structure. Chen [13] utilized a modified robust principle component analysis (RPCA) optimization function, where it incorporated offline trained speech spectral dictionary and added minimization of the energy of outlying entries to the objective function. His low-rank and sparse decomposition successfully distinguished the transient noise components by imposing sparse constraints on outlying entries. Duan $et.\ al$ introduced an online learned dictionary to enforce non-negative spectrogram decomposition. This local updated speech exemplar effectively achieved the trade off on speech distortion and noise reduction [5]. Further, Yang proposed a LSD based on a combined dictionary with respect to both speech and noise [14]. Although the supervised RPCA relying on pre-learned dictionary, to some extent, is quite similar to dictionary based non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) technique [15] and sparse coding approach [16], it specifically imposes rank constraints on background noise spectra, and demonstrates to be more flexible and effective for non-stationary noise cancellation.

2) Modulation Domain based Source Separation: Human speech is a complex signal whose magnitude envelope fluctuates timbrally in frequency and rhythmically in time. The two independent modulations, along the time and frequency axes respectively, carry important phonological information, such as syllable boundaries in the time domain, formant and pitch information in the frequency domain, and formant transitions in the T-F domain as a whole [6], [17].

In a speech enhancement framework, the time and frequency modulations in spectrogram are intuitively represented as the correlations among neighboring spectral magnitudes. These correlations have been frequently employed as a prior knowledge to improve either the noise power estimation [18] or speech magnitude estimation [19]. Typically, by incorporating 1D smooth coefficients [20] or 2D average window [21] imposed on the spectrogram, significant improvements on speech quality can be achieved by taking the correlations into account.

Instead of locally introducing correlations deriving from the modulations in spectrogram, a more straightforward way is to transform the modulations into the cepstrum domain. By utilizing pseudo frequencies, Deng $et.\ al$ [22] conducted a conditional minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimation in the cepstrum domain, and the result showed that it was a noise-robust feature selection approach. Breithaupt $et.\ al$ [23] proposed a higher cepstral coefficients smoothing scheme, in which the recursive temporal smoothing was only applied to the fine spectral structure, and it can effectively suppress the spectral peaks of short duration noise (i.e., musical noise). Gekmann $et.\ al$ enforced the statistical estimation in the temporal cepstral domain, and successfully obtained a more accurate speech presence probability estimation [24]. Veisi and Sameti introduced hidden markov models into the mel-frequency domain [25], and the results indicated a significant improvement on noise cancellation. Different from cepstrum based algorithms, Paliwal $etal.$ [26], [27] proposed a frame-wise transformation along the time axis, and in the modulation domain, the clean speech is obtained based on conventional speech estimator.

B. Method Overview

Unlike previous feature compensation approaches [28] implemented in either the spectrogram domain or the cepstral domain, in this study, two modulation subspaces of the spectrogram, including the spectral envelop subspace and the spectral details subspace, are used for speech enhancement. In the proposed algorithm, each subspace can be decomposed into a linear combination of the estimated clean speech components and noise components. This approach has two major advantages: 1) the decoupling of the speech 'carrier' and the speech 'modulator' intrinsically incorporates the correlations existed in the speech spectrogram; 2) the decoupling of modulations further strengthens the acoustic characteristics of speech components in each subspace, and makes speech components more distinctive compared with noise components. To obtain the two modulation subspaces, different techniques, including a cepstrum based modulation inverse (CMI) transform and a Hilbert transform, are comparatively used. For the CMI transform, window functions are applied to separate the spectral envelop and the spectral details along the pseudo frequency axis in the cepstrum domain, then corresponding inverse Fourier transform (IFT) is implemented to obtain two modulation subspaces in the spectrogram domain. For Hilbert transform, it is directly implemented frame-wise along the frequency axis in the spectrogram domain, and based on the output speech spectral envelop subspace, the corresponding spectral details subspace can be obtained.

In each modulation subspace, LSD are conducted to obtain the speech components. Considering that the spectral envelop subspace has a slowly varied property, noise components in this subspace share more spectral bases with speech components than that in the spectral details subspace. Previous studies indicate that dictionary based RPCA approach is superior than conventional unsupervised algorithms on improving speech quality [15]. It can accommodate instantaneous noise structure at each individual utterance and is suitable for nonstationary noise suppression. Therefore, in the spectral envelop subspace, supervised LSD can be implemented. In the spectral details subspace, the speech components show highly regular structure (i.e., fine structure), compared with noise components projected in this subspace. Therefore, a typical unsupervised RPCA method can be used to effectively extract the speech spectral details. The implementation procedure is shown in Fig. 1.

C. Contribution of Our Work

By decoupling the spectral envelop and spectral details subspaces, LSD is implemented in both subspaces in this study. The contributions of the proposed algorithms can be summarized as follows:

- A uniform acoustic-model based framework is proposed, which naturally inherits the correlations demonstrated in speech spectrogram. In other words, the decoupling of the spectral envelop and details subspaces can help to independently reduce the distortions in these two uncorrelated subspaces.
- New semi-supervised speech enhancement algorithms are proposed based on the two modulation subspaces, which provides robust features for dictionary learning.
- Two different LSD schemes are developed to be adaptive to different background noise in the spectral envelop subspace.



Fig. 1. The schematic diagram of the proposed low-rank and sparse decomposition in modulation subspace (LSD-MS) algorithm (a) and details of the proposed CMI procedure (b).

- The proposed algorithms provide highly efficient and robust solutions to single channel speech enhancement, and the comprehensive evaluation results demonstrate significant improvements on speech quality, and particularly with respect to intelligibility, compared with existing state-of-the-art algorithms.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the modulation subspace framework is presented in Section II. Section III describes the algorithms of two proposed semi-supervised LSD. In Section IV, the experiments and results are presented with the developed approaches. Finally, Section V concludes the study.

II. Modulation subspace

Considering the spectral envelop and spectral details subspaces, the noisy speech model in the spectrogram domain is given as

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= X + N = Y_e \circ Y_d \\ &= (X_e + N_e) \circ (X_d + N_d) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

in which noisy speech spectrogram matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the element-wise product of the spectral envelop matrix Y_e and spectral details matrix Y_d, same as the definition in (1). N_e and N_d are the noise components projected in each subspace, respectively. To conduct the decomposition in each subspace and extract X_e and X_d, both subspaces Y_e and Y_d can be obtained based on the noisy speech spectrogram Y. For clean speech spectrogram X, applying window functions in the cepstral domain can effectively obtain the spectral envelop and details subspaces. However, noise greatly affects the boundaries of two subspaces in the cepstral domain [29].

A. Two Modulation Subspaces Decomposition

In this study, two different methods (i.e., Hilbert transform and CMI) are applied to extract the two modulation subspaces. For Hilbert transform method, the spectral details are ideally assumed as a sinusoidal model [30], and

supposed to have higher frequencies compared with the spectral envelop. Thus, according to Bedrosian's theorem, the Hilbert transform of the spectrogram matrix can be given as

$$\mathbf{H}\{Y\} = \mathbf{H}\{Y_e \circ Y_d\} = Y_e \circ \mathbf{H}\{Y_d\} \tag{3}$$

considering Y_d is a complex sinusoidal matrix, the magnitudes of $\mathbf{H}\{Y\}$ are equal to the magnitudes of spectral envelop matrix Y_e. In this way, we can obtain the spectral envelop and spectral details matrices. However, the fine-structure of speech component exists deviation from the ideal sinusoidal model according to [31]. Therefore, CMI is employed as another way to obtain the two modulation subspaces. In CMI method, after applying discrete Fourier transform (DFT), the spectral envelop and details matrices of the noisy speech can be written as:

$$Y_e = exp(W^{-1} I_k \circ (W log(Y))) \tag{4}$$

$$Y_d = exp(W^{-1} \tilde{I}_k \circ (W log(Y))) \tag{5}$$

in which $exp(\cdot)$ and $log(\cdot)$ are defined as element-wise exponential and logarithm, and W refers to the DFT matrix

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} W_n^0 & W_n^0 & \dots & W_n^0 \\ W_n^0 & W_n^1 & \dots & W_n^{N-1} \\ \dots & \ddots & \ddots & \dots \\ W_n^0 & W_n^{n-2} & \dots & W_n^{(n-1)(n-2)} \\ W_n^0 & W_n^{n-1} & \dots & W_n^{(n-1)(n-1)} \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

where $W_n = e^{-2\pi i/n}$, and n is the number of input signal data points. I_k and $\tilde{I}_k$ are the mask matrices to select the low pseudo frequency components and high pseudo frequency components in the cepstrum domain, and defined as $I_k = V_k U^T$, and $\tilde{I}_k = \widetilde{V}_k U^T$, respectively. U is a m-element column array with unity value. V_k, and $\widetilde{V}_k$ are n-element column array, and given as

$$\begin{aligned} V_k &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \\ \widetilde{V}_k &= \begin{bmatrix} \underbrace{0 & \dots & 0}_{k+1} & 1 & \dots & 1 & \underbrace{0 & \dots & 0}_{k} \end{bmatrix}^T \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the index k is the pseudo frequency in the cepstrum domain, and its corresponding frequency f is given as $f = \frac{F_s}{2k}$, where F_s is the sampling frequency.

Considering the symmetrical characteristic of the spectrum obtained by DFT, both the V_k and $\widetilde{V}_k$ are extended with symmetrical structure. After inverse Fourier transform indicated in (4) and (5), both subspaces Y_e and Y_d can be obtained. Unlike the Hilbert transform, CMI requires no assumption on speech details structure. Based on the two methods, the obtained subspace matrices are shown in Fig. 2. Obviously, in the spectral details subspace, the Hilbert transform produces a considerably irregular speech distribution when the speech deviates from an ideal sinusoidal model. Comparatively, the proposed CMI obtains a periodical alignment of speech components.

In CMI, the masking matrix I_k directly affects the energy distribution of the two subspaces. To effectively extract the speech components from the two subspaces, an optimal k should be obtained. As shown in Fig. 3, two peak magnitudes in the cepstrum domain referred as the spectral envelop and spectral details (i.e., fine structure) are located at low pseudo frequency and high pseudo frequency regions (as marked in Fig. 3), respectively.



Fig. 2. The spectrogram of spectral envelop subspace (a)(c), and spectral details subspace (b)(d) obtained by CMI and Hilbert transform, respectively.



Fig. 3. the envelop subspaces (a) and (c), and the pseudo frequency components in the cepstrual domain (b) and (d) of clean speech and noisy speech, respectively.

Along the pseudo frequency axis, k should be able to effectively separate the two concentrated energy peaks whereas also achieve acceptable SNR for each subspace. Specifically, SNR directly affects the effectiveness of the LSD. According to the Parseval's theorem, instead of calculating SNR in the T-F domain, a cepstral domain based SNR is calculated. We define $\mathrm{SNR}_e(k)=\mathrm{E}(\mathcal{X}_e^2)/\mathrm{E}(\mathcal{N}_e^2) = \int_0^k \mathcal{X}^2(f')df' / \int_0^k \mathcal{N}^2(f')df'$. $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are the speech and noise components in the cepstral domain. Accordingly, $\mathrm{SNR}_d(k) = \int_{k+1}^{[N/2]} \mathcal{X}^2(f')df' / \int_{k+1}^{[N/2]} \mathcal{N}^2(f')df'$, where $[\cdot]$ is a round operator.

Intuitively, with lower SNR, the extraction of speech features becomes more challenge. The selection of k is a tradeoff between SNR_e and SNR_d. In other words, when k reduces SNR_d, it will increase SNR_e. Supposing the noise components obey Gaussian distribution in the cepstrum domain, and speech components are ideally concentrated in two narrow bands (as shown in Fig. 3). We define the two bands centered at k_e and k_d with

bandwidth b_e and b_d, respectively. Therefore, when $k_e < k < k_d$, $\text{SNR}_e(k) = \int_{k_e-b_e/2}^{k_e+b_e/2} \mathcal{X}^2(f^{'})df^{'} / \int_0^k \mathcal{N}^2(f^{'})df^{'} = E_e / \int_0^k \mathcal{N}^2(f^{'})df^{'}$. When k increases, $\int_0^k \mathcal{N}^2(f^{'})df^{'}$ increases, and accordingly, SNR_e will decrease. Considering that the low pseudo frequency band in the CMI mainly reflects the spectral envelop subspace, k therefore should be as smaller as possible, however, higher than $k_e + b_e/2$ to maintain the spectral envelop subspace energy. Typically, the vocal range (i.e., fundamental frequency) for human speech is about 85 Hz to 300 Hz [6]. Accordingly, the lower boundary of k should include 300 Hz fundamental frequency. Hence, we have relationship satisfying

$$85 \leq f = \frac{F_s}{2k} \leq 300 \tag{8}$$

The sampling frequency F_s is 16 kHz, and alternatively, $26.6 \leq k$ cycle in half second. In practice, when k is selected as 25-35 cycle, the results are comparable.

B. Low Rank and Sparse Characteristics of Two Subspaces

In the last section, we have demonstrated that with different k, CMI can lead to different spectral subspaces. When k is varying between the envelop peak and details peak along the pseudo frequency axis, SNR of each subspace is changed. With a given k within the range in (8), we can consider that the spectral envelop is smooth with low pseudo frequency. In previous study [13], noise matrix N has been shown to be low-rank, and in this study, both N_e and N_d are supposed to be low-rank. This assumption further can be used to justify the implementation of low-rank decomposition.

In sparsity perspective, speech components generally are more spectrally diverse than noise components [13]. This conclusion is also applicable in the proposed two modulation subspaces. The spectral envelop subspace reflects the low pseudo frequency components, and apparently it is more 'smooth' than the spectral details subspace. Such 'smooth' can be regarded as less spectral basis diversity. Specifically, X_e and N_e are both included in this 'smooth' subspace, which means their spectral convex hulls would be overlapped with high ratio. This intuitive assumption has been evidently shown in Fig. 4, where the speech and noise components are projected to the principle axes (i.e., eigenvectors). The principle directions are extracted from the clean speech spectra, and the first 3 largest and the succeeded 3 secondary largest eigenvectors are used as the 3 dimensional support basis displayed in the same space. As shown in Fig. 4(a)(c), speech spectral bases are overlapped more, compared with the spectral details subspace shown in Fig. 4(b)(d). Therefore, it is easier to separate speech components from noise components in the spectral details domain than in the spectral envelop domain.

Based on the energy distribution in the cepstrum domain, as the discussion of SNR_e and SNR_d in the last section, the spectral envelop subspace demonstrates higher SNR compared with the spectral details subspace. The highly overlapped spectral bases between speech and noise components in the spectral envelop subspace require supervised decomposition approach. Contrarily, in the spectral details subspace, speech components can be considered as the summation of several harmonics within narrow frequency band, while the noise components in this subspace generally are random statics. As a result, a general RPCA based decomposition in the spectral details subspace can be used to separate speech and noise components.



Fig. 4. The principal components projection of speech and noise samples in the spectral envelop subspace (a) and (c), and in the spectral details subspace (b) and (d), respectively.

C. Noise in the Spectral Envelop Subspace

As shown in Fig. 4, noise components share more bases with speech components in the spectral envelop subspace than in the spectral details subspace. Therefore, we further investigated how the low-rank and sparse characteristics of different types of noise affect the separation of speech and noise components in the spectral envelop subspace. In this study, 25 noise samples (as listed in Table. I) obtained from several databases, including NOISEX-92, IEEE database, and NOIZEUS, are used. The spectrograms of these noise samples are decomposed into the spectral envelop subspace as shown in Fig. 5(a), and noted as N_e. For each noise sample, N_e has an approximation form consisted of linear combinations of speech bases in the spectral envelop subspace. This projection is given as a non-negative least square optimization

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{L_a} \quad & \|N_e - D_e L_a\|_F^2 \\ s.t. \quad & L_a \geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the activation matrix L_a (as shown in Fig. 5(b)) is a linear transformation of noise matrix N_e into the speech dictionary space D_e. Both N_e and L_a matrices show low-rank and sparse characteristics. It means when the LSD is conducted, there is a trade-off on distributing the two parts of noise components into speech subspace.

To quantitatively describe the impact of different noises on speech enhancement, two indices, referred as coherent ratio and sparsity-to-low-rank ratio (SLR), are proposed to explain the general selection criterion of decomposition algorithm and parameters. The coherent ratio C is applied to measure the coherence between the noise components and speech components, and is given as

$$C(N_e, D_e) = \sum_{jk} \frac{|\langle N_{e,j}, D_{e,k} \rangle|}{\|N_{e,j}\|_2 \|D_{e,k}\|_2} \tag{10}$$

where $N_{e,j}$ denotes the jth column in N_e and $D_{e,k}$ is the kth column in D_e. Two matrices are considered less coherent if C is small. The normalized C values of 25 noise samples are summarized in Table. I, in which babble noise is strongly coherent to speech dictionary (C values at 0.85), and white Gaussian noise is much less coherent



Fig. 5. The decomposition of 25 noise samples in the spectral envelop subspace N_e (top panel) and speech dictionary space D_e (bottom panel), respectively.

to speech dictionary (C values at 0.35). In order to minimize the errors caused by incorrect distributions of noise components, the SLR R is proposed for a better understanding of the noise's energy distribution on low-rank components and sparse components. Accordingly, R is described as

$$R = \frac{\|\cdot\|_1}{\|\cdot\|_*} \tag{11}$$

where ℓ_1 norm is defined as $\|\cdot\|_1 = \sum_{ij} |\cdot|_{ij}$. The nuclear norm is $\|\cdot\|_* = \sum_i \sigma_i(\cdot)$, in which $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ is the singular value. We calculate the R values of noise samples in both the spectral envelop subspace N_e and the activation matrix L_e, corresponding to $R_{noise} = \|N_e\|_1/\|N_e\|_*$ and $R_{Activation} = \|L_a\|_1/\|L_a\|_*$, respectively.

The normalized values of R (as summarized in Table. I) ranging from 0 to 1 indicate which part of the matrix takes superiority in RPCA based decomposition. R_{Noise} represents the R values in envelop subspace, and $\mathrm{R}_{Activation}$ represents the R value in speech dictionary space. Different types of noise have various R values, which indicate the degree that they can be decomposed into speech subspace. For instance, Gaussian noise shows the highest sparsity (R_{Noise} = 1) in the spectral envelop subspace, and a considerably low rank ($\mathrm{R}_{Activation}$ = 0.06) in the speech dictionary space. In contrast, Volvo noise has the highest sparsity ($\mathrm{R}_{Activation}$ = 1) in speech dictionary space, but it is relatively low-rank (R_{Noise} = 0.39) in the spectral envelop subspace. Generally, with the assumption that speech shows sparsity characteristic, one can propose different decomposition tactic strategies to conform the SLR.

To develop robust LSD, the consideration of R value of noise can facilitate the separation of speech and noise components in the spectral envelop subspace.

TABLE I

THE SPARSITY-LOW-RANK RATIO AND COHERENT RATIO IN (16)(17) ARE PRESENTED. ALL 25 NOISE SAMPLES ARE USED, AND THE RESULTS ARE NORMALIZED TO THE RANGE $[0, 1]$.

	$C_{Coherent}$	R_{Noise}	$R_{Activation}$
$Car60mph^{*}$	0.57	0.31	0.34
$Cafeteriababble^{*}$	0.82	0.54	0.07
$Babble^{\#}$	0.85	0.55	0.11
$ConstructionCrane^{*}$	0.81	0.54	0.02
$InsideFlight^{\ddagger}$	0.53	0.44	0.66
$StreetDowntown^{*}$	0.79	0.56	0.13
$Street^{\ddagger}$	0.81	0.56	0.31
$ConstructionDrilling^{*}$	0.86	0.58	0.21
$F16^{\ddagger}$	0.83	0.92	0.44
$InsideTrain1^{*}$	0.84	0.53	0.15
$InsideTrain2^{*}$	0.68	0.22	0.39
$Train1^{\#}$	0.40	0.75	0.55
$Train2^{\ddagger}$	0.22	0.62	0.52
$PCFan^{*}$	0.27	0.31	0.84
SSN^{*}	1	0.69	0.22
$Volvo^{\ddagger}$	0.01	0.39	1
$WaterCooler^{*}$	0.86	0.56	0.30
$Machinegun^{\ddagger}$	0.52	0.01	0.01
$Leopard^{\ddagger}$	0.36	0.31	0.81
$Subway^{\#}$	0.84	0.85	0.26
$Airport^{\#}$	0.77	0.47	0.16
$Restaurant^{\#}$	0.85	0.54	0.16
$Exhibition^{\#}$	0.74	0.89	0.21
$WhiteGaussian^{\$}$	0.35	1	0.06
$Pink^{\$}$	0.85	0.87	0.23

* IEEE; ‡ Noisex 92; $^{\#}$ NOIZUS; $^{\$}$ Simulated

III. SEMI-SUPERVISED DECOMPOSITION IN MODULATION SUBSPACE

In this study, two different supervised LSD schemes are proposed in the spectral envelop subspace, and both of them are applied to obtain a robust recovery of speech components. In the spectral details subspace, a standard unsupervised RPCA is implemented.

A. Model Description

In both spectral envelop and spectral details subspaces, LSD is conducted. A basic RPCA model for both subspaces can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X_\dagger} \quad & \|X_\dagger\|_1 + \lambda \|N_\dagger\|_* \\ s.t. \quad & Y_\dagger = X_\dagger + N_\dagger \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\dagger \in \{e, d\}$ refers to the spectral envelop subspace and the spectral details subspace, respectively. As discussed in Section II, noise components share more bases with speech components in the spectral envelop subspace than that in the spectral details subspace. In other words, it is harder to distinguish noise from speech in the spectral envelop subspace without prior information. Therefore, the offline-trained speech dictionary D_e in the spectral envelop subspace is employed to separate N_e from X_e.

1) spectral envelop subspace model: In a supervised decomposition, X_e is commonly regarded as a sparse activation of a global speech dictionary. The underlying reason is that speech components in each local segment can be expressed by a few bases within a global speech dictionary space. A sparse constrain can be enforced upon the activation matrix to extract the speech components. Comparatively, for N_e, the low-rank constraints implemented in the spectral envelop subspace can effectively pick out noise components which are not within the speech dictionary space, alternatively incoherent to speech components. However, the noise components that are coherent to speech dictionary bases may not be excluded from speech components. As a result, the activation matrix of speech dictionary is mixed with some outlying entries, which represents the noise approximation. As discussed in Section II, when the SLR varies, the noise components show different probabilities to be decomposed into the speech subspace. Therefore, in this study, we proposed two different supervised decompositions, referred as a two-layers LSD (TLSD-MS) and a single layer LSD (SLSD-MS), in the spectral envelop subspace. Both decompositions are based on the consideration of reducing incoherent noise components.

The proposed TLSD-MS is straightforward on incoherent noise cancellation: after first layer LSD in the spectral envelop subspace, the second layer LSD is implemented in the activation matrix of speech dictionary. The first layer LSD can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{S_1} \quad & \|S_1\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,2}} \|L_{e,2}\|_* \\ s.t. \quad & Y_e = D_e S_1 + L_{e,2} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the spectral envelop matrix Y_e is decomposed as the summation of a low-rank matrix $L_{e,2}$, reflecting less spectrally diverse noise components, and a product of speech dictionary D_e and its sparse activation matrix S_1 [32]. In the speech components $D_e S_1$, it either exists some noise residuals or is highly distorted by tightening or relaxing the noise constraint coefficient $\lambda_{L_{e,2}}$. A natural thought is to conduct the second layer LSD in the obtained S_1. Accordingly, it can be translated as the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{S_e} \quad & \|S_e\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,1}} \|L_{e,1}\|_* \\ s.t. \quad & S_1 = S_e + L_{e,1} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $L_{e,1}$ is the activation matrix of noise components in speech dictionary space. The rationality of (14) is that even in the activation matrix, speech components S_e are still more diverse than noise components $L_{e,1}$, which has been explained in the Fig. 4(a) and (c). The TLSD-MS is quite efficient when the noise components have small R_{noise} and large $\mathrm{R}_{activation}$ (e.g., volvo noise listed in Table I).

When the background noise shows large R_{noise}, the first layer of TLSD-MS may decompose the noise components into speech with a high possibility. Moreover, the second layer of TLSD-MS only works well for those noise with high $\mathrm{R}_{activation}$ in the speech dictionary space. Hence, another decomposition scheme SLSD-MS is proposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{S,L} \quad & \|S_e\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,1}}\|L_{e,1}\|_p + \lambda_{L_{e,2}}\|L_{e,2}\|_* \\ s.t. \quad & Y_e = D_e(S_e + L_{e,1}) + L_{e,2} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $L_{e,1}$ and $L_{e,2}$ have the same definitions as in TLSD-MS, reflecting the coherent and incoherent noise components, respectively. $\|\cdot\|_p = \sum f(\sigma(\cdot))$ is a modified nuclear norm, in which $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the singular value, and f is a mapping function, defined as $f(t) = \frac{(1+p)t}{p+t}$ [33]. The conventional nuclear norm over-penalizes large singular values, and consequently may only find a biased solution. In the p-type norm, when $p \to 0$, a tighter rank approximation can be obtained. Specifically, this tight-rank approximation $\|\cdot\|_p$ can equally treat each singular value in the optimization.

2) spectral details subspace model: In the spectral details subspace, the typical RPCA decomposition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{S_d,L_d} \quad & \|S_d\|_1 + \lambda\|L_d\|_* \\ s.t. \quad & Y_d = S_d + L_d \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where S_d is considered as the approximation to X_d, and L_d corresponds to N_d. This unsupervised LSD can effectively separate speech components from noise components in the spectral details subspace. Because the speech components in the spectral details subspace show periodic structures (i.e., fine-structure as shown in Fig. 2(b)), the conventional RPCA can work well on speech extraction in the spectral details subspace.

B. Dictionary Learning

In previous work, different dictionary learning approaches have been investigated. For speech dictionary learning, recently developed batch least angle regression with coherence criterion is an effective iterative algorithm to factorize the speech samples into a dictionary and a coding matrix. However, this method imposes no constraint on the sparsity of the speech bases. Another dictionary learning approach is presented in [34], and as an efficient sparse coding algorithm, it can find succinct representations of stimuli but without taking the non-negative property into account. In contrast, NMF is a reliable method to obtain speech dictionary [35], and it can be given as

$$(D, L) = \underset{D,L}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, D(X\|DL) + \mu r(D, L) \tag{17}$$

where $D(X\|\widehat{X})$ is a cost function, $r(\cdot)$ is an optional regularization term, and μ is the regularization weight. The minimization of (17) is performed under the nonnegativity constraint of D and L. The commonly used cost functions include Euclidean distance, Bregman divergence, and the negative likelihood in the probabilistic NMFs.

In this study, a Bayesian NMF is used to learn the speech dictionary from the spectral envelop subspace X of clean speech samples. Accordingly, the input matrix is assumed to be stochastic. To perform NMF as $X \approx DL$, the following model is considered:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{nm} &= \sum_i H_{nim} \\ f_{H_{nim}}(H_{nim}) &= \mathcal{PO}(H_{nim}; D_{ni}L_{im}) \\ &= (D_{ni}L_{im})^{H_{nim}} e^{-D_{ni}L_{im}} / (H_{nim}!) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where H_{nim} are latent variables, $\mathcal{PO}(h;\lambda)$ denotes the Poisson distribution, and $H!$ is the factorial of H. Before conducting the dictionary learning procedure proposed in [15], the speech samples are reduced according to the syllable boundaries in the time domain. By this way, it excludes spectral interfere from those utterance interval, which is quite similar with noise structure.

In practice, all three approaches (i.e., LARC, efficient Sparse Coding, and Bayesian NMF) have been applied to learn the clean speech dictionary in the spectral envelop subspace. Among these dictionaries learned by the three approaches, the Bayesian NMF based dictionary showed the best speech enhancement results. Therefore, Bayesian NMF was selected as the dictionary learning method in this study.

C. Algorithms

To solve the two-layer optimization problem in (13) and (14), augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) is employed. For the first layer, the optimization solution is given as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}(S_1, A, L_{e,2}, \rho, \Delta_1, \Delta_2) \\ &= \|A\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,2}}\|L_{e,2}\|_* + \frac{\rho}{2}\|A - S_1 + \frac{\Delta_1}{\rho}\|_F^2 \\ &+ \frac{\rho}{2}\|Y_e - D_e S_1 - L_{e,2} + \frac{\Delta_2}{\rho}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where an auxiliary variable A is introduced , and assumed to be equal to S_1. After obtaining S_e, a standard RPCA based decomposition is implemented in the second layer

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}(S_e, L_{e,1}, \rho, \Delta_1) \\ &= \|S_e\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,1}}\|L_{e,1}\|_* + \frac{\rho}{2}\|S_1 - S_e - L_{e,1} + \frac{\Delta_1}{\rho}\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The proposed SLSD-MS presented in (15) can be solved by the alternative direction method of multipliers (ADMM) or ALM. However, both methods require introducing two auxiliary variables to solve (15) and expensive matrix inversions are required in each iteration. Accordingly, a recently developed method called the linearized

alternating direction method with adaptive penalty (LADMAP) is applied in this study. The augmented Lagrangian function is

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}(S_e, B, L_{e,1}, L_{e,2}, \rho, \Delta_1, \Delta_2)\\&= \|B\|_1 + \lambda_{L_{e,1}}\|L_{e,1}\|_p\\&+ \lambda_{L_{e,2}}\|L_{e,2}\|_* + \frac{\rho}{2}\|B - S_e + \frac{\Delta_1}{\rho}\|_F^2\\&+ \frac{\rho}{2}\|Y_e - D_e(S_e + L_{e,1}) - L_{e,2} + \frac{\Delta_2}{\rho}\|_F^2\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the introduced extra variable B is assumed to be equal with S_e. Specifically, to update $L_{e,1}$, a subproblem is proposed as

$$\min_{L_{e,1}} \lambda_{L_{e,1}}\|L_{e,1}\|_p + \frac{\rho}{2}\|Y_e - D_e(S_e + L_{e,1}) - L_{e,2} + \frac{\Delta_2}{\rho}\|_F^2 \tag{22}$$

here we extend the method proposed in [33] to LADMAP approach. Therefore, the conventional singular value thresholding operator can be redefined as

$$\Theta^{'}_{\partial f(\sigma)\tau}(Y) = U\mathcal{S}^{'}_{\partial f(\sigma)\tau}(\Sigma)V^* \tag{23}$$

where $Y = U\Sigma V^*$ is any singular value decomposition and $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Considering the thresholding value $\partial f(\sigma)\tau$ includes the singular value σ itself, an iterative approach is applied to yield the converged σ. Accordingly, the shrinkage operator $\mathcal{S}^{'}_{\partial f(\sigma)\tau}(\Sigma)$ has a closed-form solution at the jth inner iteration

$$\sigma^{j+1} = (\sigma_\Sigma - \partial f(\sigma^j)\tau)_+ \tag{24}$$

For (16), a same solution form as (20) can be proposed as

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{L}(S_d, L_d, \rho, \Delta_1)\\&= \|S_d\|_1 + \lambda_{L_d}\|L_d\|_* + \frac{\rho}{2}\|Y_d - S_d - L_d + \frac{\Delta_1}{\rho}\|_F^2\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

As a relaxation of ℓ_0, the ℓ_1 norm is the summation of the absolute values of all the entries. Therefore, it may lead to suppression of speech components, since speech components generally present high intensity in activation matrix compared with noise. To tight the sparsity constraint, a special strategy w.r.t energy concentration is proposed for (19)-(25), and can be given as

$$S_\dagger = max(S_\dagger, \theta) \tag{26}$$

where $\dagger \in \{1, e, d\}$. The θ is an energy threshold value set for concentrating the decomposition. The introduced energy threshold is a penalty to the sparsity relaxation, and also helps to distinguish the speech components from noise components in the activation matrix.

Generally, (19), (20), and (25) can be solved by ALM, and (21) is solved by LADMAP. With some algebra, the corresponding updating schemes of TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS are outlined in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively. $\mathcal{SR}$ and Θ are the shrinkage and singular value thresholding operators, respectively [36]. The procedure of algorithm 1 can be implemented for both (20) and (25), in which S_e and S_d are updated as S_1, and $L_{e,1}$ and L_d are updated as $L_{e,2}$. In algorithm 2, $\Theta^{'}$ is the modified singular value thresholding operator mentioned in (23), in which the shrinkage operator $\mathcal{S}^{'}_{\partial f(\sigma)\tau}(\Sigma)$ is implemented in an inner iterative until divergence. $\eta = \|Y_1\|_2^2$.

Algorithm 1 Proposed model to solve problem (19)

Input:noisy speech envelop matrix $Y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ and offline-trained dictionary D_e, parameters $\lambda_{L_{e,2}} > 0$, $\rho^0 > 0$, θ, tolerance ϵ and $\mu > 1$.

Initialize: Set maxIter, and Terminate $\leftarrow$ False. Initialize S_1^0, A^0, $L_{e,2}^0$, Δ_1^0 and Δ_2^0 to zero.

1: **while** Terminate=False **do**

2: Update S_1^{k+1}:

$$S_1^{k+1} = (D_e^T D_e + I)^{-1}(D_e^T Y_e - D_e^T L_{e,2}^k + A^k + \frac{D_e^T \Delta_2^k}{\rho^k} + \frac{\Delta_1^k}{\rho^k})$$
$$S_1^{k+1} = max(S_1^{k+1}, \theta)$$

3: Update A^{k+1}:

$$A^{k+1} = \max(SR_{\rho_k^{-1}}(S_1^{k+1} + \frac{\Delta_1^k}{\rho^k}), 0)$$

4: Update $L_{e,2}^{k+1}$:

$$L_{e,2}^{k+1} = \Theta_{\lambda_{L_{e,2}}/\rho^k}(Y_e - D_e S_1^{k+1} + \frac{\Delta_2^k}{\rho^k})$$

5: Update the Lagrangian multipliers:

$$\Delta_1^{k+1} = \Delta_1^k + \rho^k(A^{k+1} - S_1^{k+1})$$
$$\Delta_2^{k+1} = \Delta_2^k + \rho^k(Y_e - D_e S_1^{k+1} - L_{e,2}^{k+1})$$
$$\rho^{k+1} = \mu\rho^k.$$

6: **if** $\|A^{k+1} - S_1^{k+1}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ and $\|A^{k+1} - A^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ and $\|L_{e,2}^{k+1} - L_{e,2}^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ or (k $\geq$ maxIter) **then**

7: Terminate $\leftarrow$ True

8: **end if**

9: **end while**

Output: Optimal active coefficient matrix $S_* = S_1^k$

Algorithm 2 Proposed model to solve problem (21)

Input: noisy speech envelop matrix $Y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ and offline-trained dictionary D_e, parameters $\lambda_{L_{e,1}} > 0$ and $\lambda_{L_{e,2}} > 0$, $\rho^0 > 0$, θ, and $\mu > 1$.

Initialize: Set maxIter, tolerance ϵ and Terminate $\leftarrow$ False. Initialize S_e^0, B^0, $L_{e,1}^0$, $L_{e,2}^0$, Δ_1^0 and Δ_2^0 to zero.

1: **while** Terminate=False **do**

2: Update S_e^{k+1}:

$$\begin{aligned} S_e^{k+1} =&(D_e^T D_e + I)^{-1}(D_e^T Y_e - D_e^T D_e L_{e,1}^k - \\ & D_e^T L_{e,2}^k + B^k + \frac{D_e^T \Delta_2^k}{\rho^k} + \frac{\Delta_1^k}{\rho^k}) \\ S_e^{k+1} =& max(S_e^{k+1}, \theta) \end{aligned}$$

3: Update B^{k+1}:

$$B^{k+1} = \max(SR_{\rho_k^{-1}}(S_e^{k+1} + \frac{\Delta_{1,k}}{\rho^k}), 0)$$

4: Update $L_{e,1}^{k+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{e,1}^{k+1} = \Theta'_{\partial f(\sigma)\lambda_{L_{e,1}}(\eta\rho_k)^{-1}}(L_{e,1}^k + D_e^T(Y_e - D_e(S_e^{k+1} \\ + L_{e,1}^k) - L_{e,2}^k + \frac{\Delta_2^k}{\rho^k})/\eta) \end{aligned}$$

5: Update $L_{e,2}^{k+1}$:

$$L_{e,2}^{k+1} = \Theta_{\lambda_{L_{e,2}}/\rho^k}(Y_e - D_e(S_e^{k+1} + L_{e,1}^{k+1}) + \frac{\Delta_2^k}{\rho^k})$$

6: Update the Lagrangian multipliers:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1^{k+1} &= \Delta_1^k + \rho^k(Y_e - D_e(S_e^{k+1} + L_{e,1}^{k+1}) - L_{e,2}^{k+1}) \\ \Delta_2^{k+1} &= \Delta_2^k + \rho^k(B^{k+1} - S_e^{k+1}) \\ \rho^{k+1} &= \mu\rho^k. \end{aligned}$$

7: **if** $\|B^k - S_e^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ and $\|B^{k+1} - B^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ and $\|L_{e,1}^{k+1} - L_{e,1}^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ or (k $\geq$ maxIter) **then**

8: Terminate $\leftarrow$ True

9: **end if**

10: **end while**

Output: Optimal active coefficient matrix $S_* = S_e^k$

IV. Experiments and Results

In this section, the proposed speech enhancement algorithms, TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS, are evaluated and compared with other state-of-the-art speech enhancement algorithms. In Section IV-A, the robustness of the speech dictionary in the spectral envelop subspace is validated. In Section IV-B, noise with different coherent ratios are utilized to obtain a better understanding of the merits of TLDS-MS and SLDS-MS algorithms. Evaluations via benchmark metrics and intelligibility indexes are presented in Section IV-C and IV-D, respectively.

In our simulation, all speech and noise signals are down-sampled to 16 kHz and the DFT was implemented using a frame length of 512 samples and 0.5-overlapped Hann windows. The randomly selected test set of IEEE database (150 samples) [37] is exploited for the noise reduction evaluation. The signal synthesis is performed using the overlap-and-add procedure, and 23 noise samples selected from environmental and industrial noise database [38] plus two simulated noise (white Gaussian and pink noise) are used at various input SNRs (-10 dB to 10 dB). The dictionaries are all consisted of 450 basis vectors learned from randomly selected 30 speech samples from corresponding database (i.e., IEEE dataset, NOIZUS, and CMU).

A. Evaluation of the Robustness of Dictionary

We evaluate the robustness of three speech dictionaries learned from different speech databases (i.e., IEEE dataset, NOIZUS, and CMU) separately. All speech dictionaries are learned in the spectral envelop subspace. For each dictionary, 30 speech utterances randomly selected from corresponding database are used as the exemplar samples, and equal male and female speakers are considered. Specifically, for the speech dictionary learned from IEEE dataset, the selected 30 speech samples are not overlapped with the 150 test utterances. All three dictionaries are incorporated in the proposed TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS algorithms to implement denoising at various SNRs (-10, -5, 0, 5, and 10 dB), and simulated white Gaussian is used as the additive background noise. Three objective metrics, perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ), segmental SNRs (SegSNR) [38], and signal to distortion (SDR) are used to quantitatively evaluate the performance of the speech enhancement algorithms we investigated.

As shown in Fig. 6, for all dictionaries, both proposed algorithms achieve comparable performance with respect to three metrics. For SegSNR, different dictionaries obtain similar results, and show deviations less than 0.3 dB with each other at SNR 10 dB SNR. For SDR, the maximum difference among three dictionaries is less than 1.2 dB at 10 dB SNR. For PESQ metric, all three dictionaries obtain similar improvements, and the deviations are smaller than 0.1. The results show that all the dictionaries learned from the spectral envelop subspace demonstrate robust performance.

Comparatively, the conventional supervised speech enhancement techniques are heavily affected by speaker identity because their dictionaries are directly learned from spectral space. Small scale dictionary may exhibit significant performance gaps when applied to corrupted speech samples collected from different speakers. However, a big scale dictionary unavoidably introduces the overfitting issue. In our approach, without introducing the spectral details subspace that correlated to speaker identity, the envelop based dictionary has the merit to be robust on speech extraction from high level background noise.



Fig. 6. Performance evaluations of two proposed algorithms at various SNRs for three speech dictionaries learned from three different speech databases. In the legend, each dictionary is labeled as the corresponding database. The suffix 1 and 2 refer to the algorithm TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS, respectively.

B. Coherent and Incoherent Noise Reduction by the Proposed Algorithms

In this section, different types of noise samples are applied to test the proposed TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS algorithms. Eight noise samples, including car, babble, construction crane, jet F16, fan noise, Volvo, machine gun, and white Gaussian, are used to represent various coherent ratio and SLR (as shown in Fig. 5 and Table I).

As shown in Fig. 7, the proposed algorithms achieve the best performance on Volvo noise, because this noise sample has the lowest coherence ratio (i.e., $C_{Volvo} = 0.01$). Generally, the performance of both algorithms decreases as the coherence ratio increases. For instance, the averaged performance of machinegun noise ($C_{machinegun} = 0.52$) is higher than that of babble noise ($C_{babble} = 0.85$), which is comparable with the results of crane noise ($C_{crane} = 0.81$). The reason is that high coherence ratio causes ambiguity on speech extraction.

The results in Fig.7 also reveal that, not only coherent ratio can greatly affect the performance, the SLR also plays a role on noise cancellation in the proposed speech enhancement framework. It clearly shows that the averaged performance of jet F16 noise ($C_{F16} = 0.83$) is better than that of babble noise ($C_{babble} = 0.85$), despite the two noise samples have almost the same coherence ratios. The same situation happens for machinegun noise ($C_{machinegun} = 0.52$) and car noise ($C_{car} = 0.57$). The potential explanation may be that jet F16 and machinegun noise demonstrates either a superior low-rank ($R_{F16,Noise} = 0.92$) in the spectral envelop subspace or a more sparsity ($R_{Machinegun,Noise} = 0.01$,$R_{Machinegun,Activation} = 0.01$) in both the spectral envelop subspace and the speech dictionary space. These characteristics help the background noise more distinguishable, and by utilizing SLR, the proposed algorithms can impose low-rank and sparse constraints to separate the speech and noise components



Fig. 7. Three metrics to evaluate the performances of the proposed TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS algorithms at different background noise scenario (8 different types of noise samples at various SNR levels (i.e., -10 ,-5 , 0, 5, 10 dB)).

successfully.

C. Assessment via Speech Quality Metrics

The performance of the proposed TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS algorithms are compared with four state-of-the-art speech enhancement algorithms, including MMSE-SPP [39], NMF-RPCA [13], RPCA [7], and LARC [16]. The evaluation is implemented across 25 noise samples at various SNRs (-10,-5, 0, 5, and 10 dB). Each benchmark algorithm is fine-tuned to be one of the best alternatives.

Figure 8 shows performance evaluation by three speech quality metrics, including the source to distortion ratio (SDR), source to interference ratio (SIR), and source to artifact ratio (SAR) from the BSS-Eval toolbox [40]. SDR measures the overall quality of the enhanced speech, whereas SIR and SAR are proportional to the amount of noise reduction and inverse of the speech distortion. The results show that both proposed LSD-MS algorithms take advantages over four other algorithms with respect to all three metrics. In addition, SLSD-MS algorithm demonstrates slightly better performance than that of TLSD-MS algorithm. The underlying reason could be that a large part of selected noise samples have low SLR values, which are suitable for SLSD-MS algorithm.

Evaluation results using SegSNRs and PESQ are shown in Fig. 9. Both TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS algorithms outperform four other algorithms in terms of PESQ and SegSNR, and this superiority is especially significant when compared with unsupervised methods (i.e., MMSE-SPP and RPCA) at low SNRs. As a supervised technique, NMF-RPCA also achieves a good performance at low SNRs. The dictionary based speech recovery techniques can more effectively extract the speech components when speech is severely corrupted by background noise. Specifically, two proposed algorithms utilize the structure characteristics of speech and noise spectrogram in two modulated subspaces, and successfully avoid the general issues of dictionary based speech enhancement, such as overfitting and speech-like noise.



Fig. 8. SDR, SIR, and SAR of two proposed algorithms (TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS) and four other algorithms at various SNRs (-10, -5, 0, 5, and 10 dB). The results are averaged over 25 different types of noise samples.



Fig. 9. PESQ and SegSNR of two proposed algorithms (TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS) and four other algorithms at various SNRs (-10, -5, 0, 5, and 10 dB). The results are averaged over 25 different types of noise samples.

D. Assessment via Speech Intelligibility Metrics

To evaluate the performance of proposed algorithms on intelligibility of enhanced speech, three popular indexes, including hearing-aid speech quality index (HASQI) [41], normalized covariance metric (NCM) [42], and short-time objective intelligibility (STOI) [43], are employed in this section. HASQI has great potential to specifically capture quality when speech is subjected to a wide variety of distortions. This index can accurately predict the speech intelligibility ratings and generally as an improved version of Coherence speech intelligibility index (CSII). NCM is similar to the speech-transmission index (STI), and it computes the STI as a weighted sum of transmission index values determined from the envelops of the probe and response signals in each frequency band. STOI is also applied to validate the short time segmentation of the enhanced speech. All three metrics are expected to have a monotonic relation with the subjective speech-intelligibility, where a higher value denotes better intelligible speech.

Figure 10 shows the speech intelligibility evaluations of the proposed algorithms compared with four other state-of-the-art algorithms at various SNRs. Both proposed algorithms demonstrate superiority on all three intelligibility metrics. Specifically, at low SNRs (-10 and -5 dB), significant intelligibility improvements have been achieved by our proposed algorithms when compared with those benchmark algorithms. Specifically, for two other supervised algorithms, NMF-RPCA and LARC, their intelligibility improvements degrade greatly at low SNRs. One reason is that our proposed algorithms learn dictionaries from the spectral envelop subspace, which avoids the interference from the spectral details subspace. The benefit is that when the noise level increases, the energy in the spectral details subspace can produce a biased approximation to both speech and noise components. Another substantial explanation is that our supervised algorithms mainly focus on the recovery of the spectral envelop of speech, which is directly associated with speech intelligibility. In addition, the SLDS-MS algorithm demonstrates better intelligibility improvements than the TLSD-MS algorithm. Because, for noise with small $\mathrm{R}_{Activation}$, the tight low-rank constraints imposed by SLDS-MS works better to separate the low-rank noise components and sparse speech components in the spectral envelop subspace.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel modulation subspace based speech enhancement framework. An acoustic model referred as formant-and-pitch was applied to obtain the spectral envelop and spectral details subspaces, in which supervised and unsupervised low-rank and sparse decompositions were implemented, respectively. To obtain the speech dictionary in the spectral envelop subspace, BNMF was utilized to inherently capture the temporal dependencies. Two different LDS schemes in the spectral envelop subspace were developed. By imposing different forms of norm to constraint rank and sparsity, the two approaches aimed to be adaptive to various background noise. The performance of the two developed algorithms were compared with other four existing speech enhancement algorithms, including MMSE-SPP [39], NMF-RPCA [13], RPCA [7] and LARC [16]. Results showed that our developed algorithms not only showed robust performance under different background noise, but also achieved remarked improvements on speech perceptional quality with respect to various metrics. In addition, considerably robust performance is also demonstrated for different speech dictionaries obtained from several databases in spectral



Fig. 10. HASPI, NCM, and STOI of two proposed algorithms (TLSD-MS and SLSD-MS) and four other algorithms at various SNRs (-10, -5, 0, 5, and 10 dB). The results are averaged over 25 different types of noise samples.

envelop subspace. Results showed that the MS based LDS approaches demonstrated significant improvements on speech intelligibility, when compared with other state-of-the-art algorithms.

VI. Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the Illinois Clean Coal Institute (ICCI) with funds made available by the State of Illinois.

References

[1] P. C. Loizou and G. Kim, "Reasons why current speech-enhancement algorithms do not improve speech intelligibility and suggested solutions," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 47–56, 2011.

[2] M. R. Schroeder and B. S. Atal, "Code-excited linear prediction (celp): High-quality speech at very low bit rates," in *Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, IEEE International Conference on ICASSP'85.*, vol. 10. IEEE, 1985, pp. 937–940.

[3] G. Hinton, L. Deng, D. Yu, G. E. Dahl, A.-r. Mohamed, N. Jaitly, A. Senior, V. Vanhoucke, P. Nguyen, T. N. Sainath *et al.*, "Deep neural networks for acoustic modeling in speech recognition: The shared views of four research groups," *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 82–97, 2012.

[4] A. V. Oppenheim and R. W. Schafer, "From frequency to quefrency: A history of the cepstrum," *Signal Processing Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 95–106, 2004.

[5] Z. Duan, G. J. Mysore, and P. Smaragdis, "Speech enhancement by online non-negative spectrogram decomposition in non-stationary noise environments." in *INTERSPEECH*, 2012, pp. 595–598.

[6] T. M. Elliott and F. E. Theunissen, "The modulation transfer function for speech intelligibility," *PLoS comput biol*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. e1000302, 2009.

[7] P.-S. Huang, S. D. Chen, P. Smaragdis, and M. Hasegawa-Johnson, "Singing-voice separation from monaural recordings using robust principal component analysis," in *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2012 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 57–60.

[8] H. Papadopoulos and D. P. Ellis, "Music-content-adaptive robust principal component analysis for a semantically consistent separation of foreground and background in music audio signals," in *DAFx-14*, 2014.

[9] Y.-H. Yang, "On sparse and low-rank matrix decomposition for singing voice separation," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2012, pp. 757–760.

[10] C. Sun, Q. Zhu, and M. Wan, "A novel speech enhancement method based on constrained low-rank and sparse matrix decomposition," *Speech Communication*, vol. 60, pp. 44–55, 2014.

[11] A. Röbel, F. Villavicencio, and X. Rodet, "On cepstral and all-pole based spectral envelope modeling with unknown model order," *Pattern Recognition Letters*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 1343–1350, 2007.

[12] A. Bouzid, N. Ellouze *et al.*, "Speech enhancement based on wavelet packet of an improved principal component analysis," *Computer Speech & Language*, vol. 35, pp. 58–72, 2016.

[13] Z. Chen and D. P. Ellis, "Speech enhancement by sparse, low-rank, and dictionary spectrogram decomposition," in *Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA), 2013 IEEE Workshop on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–4.

[14] Y.-H. Yang, "Low-rank representation of both singing voice and music accompaniment via learned dictionaries." in *ISMIR*, 2013, pp. 427–432.

[15] N. Mohammadiha, P. Smaragdis, and A. Leijon, "Supervised and unsupervised speech enhancement using nonnegative matrix factorization," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 2140–2151, 2013.

[16] C. D. Sigg, T. Dikk, and J. M. Buhmann, "Speech enhancement using generative dictionary learning," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 1698–1712, 2012.

[17] A. M. Liberman, *Speech: A special code*. MIT press, 1996.

[18] T. Gerkmann and R. C. Hendriks, "Unbiased mmse-based noise power estimation with low complexity and low tracking delay," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1383–1393, 2012.

[19] I. Cohen, "Noise spectrum estimation in adverse environments: Improved minima controlled recursive averaging," *Speech and Audio Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 466–475, 2003.

[20] R. Martin, "Noise power spectral density estimation based on optimal smoothing and minimum statistics," *Speech and Audio Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 504–512, 2001.

[21] T. Gerkmann, C. Breithaupt, and R. Martin, "Improved a posteriori speech presence probability estimation based on a likelihood ratio with fixed priors," *Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 910–919, 2008.

[22] L. Deng, J. Droppo, and A. Acero, "Estimating cepstrum of speech under the presence of noise using a joint prior of static and dynamic features," *Speech and Audio Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 218–233, 2004.

[23] C. Breithaupt, T. Gerkmann, and R. Martin, "Cepstral smoothing of spectral filter gains for speech enhancement without musical noise," *Signal Processing Letters, IEEE*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 1036–1039, 2007.

[24] T. Gerkmann, M. Krawczyk, and R. Martin, "Speech presence probability estimation based on temporal cepstrum smoothing," in *Acoustics Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2010 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 4254–4257.

[25] H. Veisi and H. Sameti, "Speech enhancement using hidden markov models in mel-frequency domain," *Speech Communication*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 205–220, 2013.

[26] K. Paliwal, K. Wójcicki, and B. Schwerin, "Single-channel speech enhancement using spectral subtraction in the short-time modulation domain," *Speech communication*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 450–475, 2010.

[27] K. Paliwal, B. Schwerin, and K. Wójcicki, "Speech enhancement using a minimum mean-square error short-time spectral modulation magnitude estimator," *Speech Communication*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 282–305, 2012.

[28] H. K. Kim and R. C. Rose, "Cepstrum-domain acoustic feature compensation based on decomposition of speech and noise for asr in noisy environments," *Speech and Audio Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 435–446, 2003.

[29] J. P. Openshaw and J. Masan, "On the limitations of cepstral features in noise," in *Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1994. ICASSP-94., 1994 IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 2. IEEE, 1994, pp. II–49.

[30] R. McAulay and T. Quatieri, "Speech analysis/synthesis based on a sinusoidal representation," *IEEE Transactions on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 744–754, 1986.

[31] G. de Krom, "A cepstrum-based technique for determining a harmonics-to-noise ratio in speech signals," *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 254–266, 1993.

[32] E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright, "Robust principal component analysis?" *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 58, no. 3, p. 11, 2011.

[33] Z. Kang, C. Peng, and Q. Cheng, "Robust pca via nonconvex rank approximation," in *Data Mining (ICDM), 2015 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 211–220.

[34] H. Lee, A. Battle, R. Raina, and A. Y. Ng, "Efficient sparse coding algorithms," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2006, pp. 801–808.

[35] J. F. Gemmeke, T. Virtanen, and A. Hurmalainen, "Exemplar-based sparse representations for noise robust automatic speech recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 2067–2080, 2011.

[36] L. Zhuang, H. Gao, Z. Lin, Y. Ma, X. Zhang, and N. Yu, "Non-negative low rank and sparse graph for semi-supervised learning," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2012 IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2328–2335.

[37] P. C. Loizou, *Speech enhancement: theory and practice*. CRC press, 2013.

[38] Y. Hu and P. C. Loizou, "Evaluation of objective quality measures for speech enhancement," *IEEE Transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 229–238, 2008.

[39] R. C. Hendriks, T. Gerkmann, and J. Jensen, "Dft-domain based single-microphone noise reduction for speech enhancement: A survey of the state of the art," *Synthesis Lectures on Speech and Audio Processing*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–80, 2013.

[40] E. Vincent, R. Gribonval, and C. Févotte, "Performance measurement in blind audio source separation," *IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1462–1469, 2006.

[41] J. M. Kates and K. H. Arehart, "The hearing-aid speech quality index (hasqi) version 2," *Journal of the Audio Engineering Society*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 99–117, 2014.

[42] J. Ma, Y. Hu, and P. C. Loizou, "Objective measures for predicting speech intelligibility in noisy conditions based on new band-importance functions," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 125, no. 5, pp. 3387–3405, 2009.

[43] C. H. Taal, R. C. Hendriks, R. Heusdens, and J. Jensen, "An algorithm for intelligibility prediction of time–frequency weighted noisy speech," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 2125–2136, 2011.